

Dylan D. Grimes (SBN 302981)
Paige M. Tomaselli (SBN 237737)
Lauren A. Andino (SBN 344132)

GRIME LAW LLP

11846 Ventura Blvd., Ste 200

Studio City, CA 91604

Telephone: (310) 747-5095

dgrimes@grimelaw.com

ptomaselli@grimelaw.com

landino@grimelaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
WESTERN DIVISION**

ALICE MERTON, an individual,
MERTON & GRAUWINKEL GMBH,
a German corporation, PAPER PLANE
PUBLISHING GMBH, a German
corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

YE, an individual, and YEEZY
RECORD LABEL, LLC, a limited
liability company,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-02615

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY TO
DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE TO
MOTION TO SERVE
DEFENDANT YE BY
PUBLICATION AND FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME**

REPLY

Plaintiffs Alice Merton, Merton & Grauwinkel GMBH, and Paper Plane Publishing GMBH (“Plaintiffs”) submit this Reply in response to Defendant Yeezy Record Label, LLC’s (“Defendant” or “YRL”) Response to Plaintiffs’ Motions to Serve Defendant Ye by Publication and for Extension of Time.

While Defendant YRL’s counsel has repeatedly stated that he does not represent Defendant Ye in this matter and therefore cannot accept service on his behalf, Counsel does represent Ye, the individual, in another matter before this Court – ARTIST REVENUE ADVOCATES, LLC v. KANYE OMARI WEST a/k/a “YE,” et al. (Case No. 2:24-CV-06018).

It should also be noted that in Defendant YRL’s Notice of Interested Parties (Local Rule 7.1-1), filed with its Answer in this Court on July 3, 2025, states “Attorneys for Defendants Ye f/k/a KANYE OMARI WEST and YEEZY RECORD LABEL LLC” in the signature block of the document.

Finally, Yeezy Record Label, LLC is not opposing this motion. In its reply, it clearly states “Defendant Yeezy Record Label, LLC takes no position regarding the pending motions to serve Defendant Ye by publication and for extension of time.” Therefore, based on the motions, the issue of whether this Court should allow service of Defendant Ye by publication is unopposed. While publication by service is not ideal solution for Plaintiffs, here it is the most reasonable path forward in order to properly serve Defendant Ye.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant Plaintiffs’ Motion to serve Defendant Ye by publication, or in the alternative, for an extension of time to serve Defendant Ye.

1 Dated: July 25, 2025

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 **GRIME LAW LLP**

4
5 By: /s/ Lauren Andino

6 Dylan Grimes

7 Paige Tomaselli

8 Lauren Andino

9 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

10 *ALICE MERTON, MERTON &*

11 *GRAUWINKEL GMBH, PAPER PLANE*

12 *PUBLISHING GMBH*